



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.             | CONFIRMATION NO.            |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/596,900  | 06/28/2006  | Osamu Uchida         | 40639                           | 1976                        |
| 52054   | 7590        | 11/01/2007           |                                 |                             |
| PEARNE & GORDON LLP<br>1801 EAST 9TH STREET<br>SUITE 1200<br>CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>WANG, HARRIS C      |                             |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2139                | PAPER NUMBER                |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE<br>11/01/2007 | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com  
dchervenak@pearne.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,900

Applicant(s)

UCHIDA, OSAMU

Examiner

Harris C. Wang

Art Unit

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are pending

### *Specification*

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### *Drawings*

The drawings are objected to because S20 of Figure 2 recites "Display File/ Directory List in Selccted Directory." It should read "Display File/ Directory List in Selected Directory." Figure 3 shows the step "Obtaine directory/File List information." It should read "Obtain." Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or

"New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-8, recites the limitation "an application standard." It is unclear which application standard, or what an example of application standard is.

Claims 2-7 depend on Claim 1 and are rejected for the same rationale. Claim 4 recites the limitation "therebetween." The word "therebetween" could not be found at Dictionary.com, and is thus considered indefinite.

Claims 6-7 recite the limitations " the list obtaining unit " and "the list" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2139

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano (6588667).

Regarding Claim 1,

Nakano teaches an information equipment on which a recording medium is detachably mounted, comprising:

a directory information obtaining unit that obtains directory information stored in the recording medium mounted; (*"a reader to read data information or directory information recorded in a recording medium" Column 1, lines 52-53*)

a directory judging unit that judges whether a directory name of a directory contained in the directory information obtained by the directory information obtaining unit is contained in a list of directory names conformed to an application standard defining a specification concerning storage of data of each application; (*"a judging section to compare the specific information with the data information or the directory information read from the recording medium, to judge whether or not the specific information conforms with the data information or the directory information, and to indicate a conforming case or a nonconforming case as a judgment result" Column 1, lines 59-65*)

and an access restricting unit that, when the directory of the directory name contained in the list is selected, enables an access to the data in the selected directory through only an application adapted to the selected directory. (*"a controller to control a working mode such that a first working mode is conducted in the conforming case and a second working mode...is conducted in the nonconforming case" Column 1 lines 66-67, Column 2, lines 1-2) ("the controller...does not apply the limitation to the handling as a non limiting mode which is conducted as the other one of the first working mode and the second working mode" Column 2, lines 43-50)*

Regarding Claim 3,

Nakano teaches the information equipment according to claim 1, further comprising a judgment result outputting unit that outputs a judgment result of the directory judging unit with respect to all the directories obtained by the directory information obtaining unit. (*"As a result of the comparison judgment, in the case that the specific information does not conform with the directory information or the data information...no limitation is provided when the data information recorded in the recording medium are handled from the computer." Column 5, lines 57-63)*

Regarding Claims 6-7,

Art Unit: 2139

Nakano teaches the information equipment according claim 1, wherein the list information obtaining unit obtains the list stored in the information equipment.

wherein the list information obtaining unit obtains the list stored in the mounted recording medium. (*"A specific information storing section stores specific data information recorded in the recording medium such as specific information used to confirm whether or not specific data information or directory information is recorded in a recording medium. A judging section 330 compares the specific information with data information or directory information read from the recording medium"* Column 4, lines 41-16)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2, 4, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano.

Regarding Claim 2,

Nakano teaches the information equipment according to claim 1, wherein when the directory of the directory name contained in the list is selected,

Nakano does not explicitly teach the access restricting unit judging whether an application adapted to the selected directory exists in the information equipment, and if so, activating the application when the application adapted to the selected directory exists, and if not, outputting a message indicating inaccessibility when no application adapted to the selected directory exists.

Because it is well known to map file extensions to applications, and the directory is the folder containing like file extensions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Nakano to include an application adapted to the selected directory and to indicate a message of inaccessibility when no selected directory exists.

The motivation is to provide a different way of selecting applications to access a directory of like files.

Regarding Claim 4,

Nakano teaches the information equipment according to claim 3, wherein the judgment result outputting unit displays a directory name contained in the list and a directory name which are not contained in the list. (*"As a result of the comparison*



*judgment, in the case that the specific information does not conform with the directory information or the data information...no limitation is provided when the data information recorded in the recording medium are handled from the computer." Column 5, lines 57-63)*

Nakano does not explicitly teach wherein the directories on the list and the directories not on the list vary in color.

Because Nakano already teaches the main aspect of the invention, which is judging whether the directory is contained in a list, and programmers of ordinary skill in the art would be able to vary the font color, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the color of directories contained in the list and those not contained in the list.

The motivation is to fulfill a design choice.

Regarding Claim 8,

Nakano teaches the information equipment according to claim 1. Nakano does not explicitly teach wherein the list is set so that a directory name conformed to the application standard is associated with the type of the recording medium.

Because many directory names are associated with types of mediums (My Documents, My Pictures, My Music) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a list set so that a directory name is associated with the type of recording medium,

The motivation is to provide a description of the type of recording medium in the directory.

Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of Windows XP.

Regarding Claim 5,

Nakano teaches the information equipment according to claim 3. Nakano does not explicitly teach wherein the judgment result outputting unit displays a directory name contained in the list along with an icon associated with an application adapted to a directory of the directory name.

Windows XP, released in 2001, has had an icon for the My Music Directory that had an icon associated with the application associated with the directory.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Nakano to include an icon associated with the application associated with the directory.

The motivation is it is well known to include an icon associated with the application to represent a directory.

### ***Conclusion***


Art Unit: 2139

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harris C. Wang whose telephone number is 5712701462. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5:30, Alternate Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYZ R. SHEIKH can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HCW

  
SYED A. ZIA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER